

Application No. 10/640369 (Docket: CNTR.2200)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 12/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 09/02/2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 are pending in the application. The Examiner additionally stated that claims 1-11 are allowed and claims 12-17 are rejected. By this amendment, claim 12 has been amended. Hence, claims 1-17 are pending in the application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the foregoing amendments.

In the Claims

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 1-11 are allowed. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration and indications of allowability of these claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sprague et al., US6496038B1 (hereinafter, Sprague). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

With regard to independent claim 12, the Examiner noted that Sprague discloses, at least in Fig. 2, a method of registering a logic function (220) and generating a non-inverted output signal (266), comprising:

- pre-setting a first node (237) while a clock signal (CK) is in a first logic state (LOW);
- evaluating a logic function to control the logic state of the first node when the clock signal transitions to a second logic state (HIGH);
- driving a second node (267) to an opposite logic state (LOW) of the first node in response to the clock signal transitioning to its second logic state (HIGH);
- maintaining (220) the second node at its previously driven logic state when the clock signal transitions back to the first logic state (LOW) from the second logic state;

Application No. 10/640369 (Docket: CNTR.2200)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 12/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 09/02/2005

- driving a third node (output 230A) to an opposite logic state of the second node; and
- driving an output node (266) based on the states of the first and third nodes (noting that even though the first (237) and third (output of 230A) nodes are not directly connected to the output node, the output node (266) is driven based on the states of the first and third nodes).

Claim 12 as amended herein is recited below for ease of reference.

12. A method of registering a logic function and generating a non-inverted output signal, comprising:

pre-setting a first node while a clock signal is in a first logic state;

evaluating a logic function to control the logic state of the first node when the clock signal transitions to a second logic state;

driving a second node to an opposite logic state of the first node in response to the clock signal transitioning to its second logic state;

maintaining the second node at its previously driven logic state when the clock signal transitions back to the first logic state from the second logic state;

driving a third node to an opposite logic state of the second node; and

driving an output node based on the states of the first and third nodes, wherein the output node is driven by an output stage, and wherein the output stage comprises a first pull-up device and a first pull-down device, both responsive to the first node, and a second pull-up device and a second pull-down device, both responsive to the third node.

Applicant respectfully notes that Sprague does not show an output circuit coupled to first and third nodes which drives an output node based on the states of the first and third nodes, where the output node is driven by an output stage, and where the output stage comprises a first pull-up device and a first pull-down device, both responsive to the first node, and a second pull-up device and a second pull-down device, both responsive to the

Application No. 10/640369 (Docket: CNTR.2200)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 12/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 09/02/2005

third node.. In Sprague, static stages 230B-230D are coupled in series and the first stage 230B is not coupled to the first node but is only coupled to, and thus only responsive to the state of the output of the first static stage 230A. Consequently, Sprague does not teach an output stage that includes a first pull-up device and a first pull-down device, both responsive to the first node, and a second pull-up device and a second pull-down device, both responsive to the third node.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of claim 12.

With respect to claims 13-17, these claims depend from claim 12 and add further limitations that are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Sprague. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejections to claims 13-17.

Application No. 10/640369 (Docket: CNTR.2200)
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 12/02/2005
Reply to Office Action of 09/02/2005

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the arguments advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested, and allowance of the claims is solicited.

Applicant earnestly requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions concerning this amendment, the application, or allowance of any claims thereof.

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8 that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date of signature shown below.

Respectfully submitted,
HUFFMAN PATENT GROUP, LLC

/Richard K. Huffman/

By: _____

RICHARD K. HUFFMAN, P.E.
Registration No. 41,082
Tel: (719) 575-9998

12/02/2005

Date: _____